

1927
Pam. Asiatic immigr.
MISSISSIPPI
LIBRARY
TO
ORY

CALIFORNIA AND THE JAPANESE

A Compilation of Arguments Advertised in
Newspapers by the American Committee
of Justice in Opposition to the Alien
Land Law, Together With the
Memorial Addressed to
Congress by the Said
Committee



The American Committee of Justice
1904 Adeline Street
Oakland, California

December, 1920



This pamphlet was originally published by the American Committee of Justice under the title of "Arguments Against the California Alien Land Law." It is reprinted with permission by the Japanese Association of America, 444 Bush Street, San Francisco.

Members of the American Committee of Justice

Lyman J. Gage, San Diego, formerly Secretary of the Treasury
Mrs. C. E. Cumberson, Clear Lake
Payson J. Treat, Professor of History, Stanford University
Mrs. C. J. Heggerty, San Francisco
Dr. David Starr Jordan, Chancellor Emeritus, Stanford University
Rev. James L. Gordon, First Congregational Church, San Francisco
Leroy Wright, State Senator, San Diego
Bertha E. Kori, Los Angeles
Carson C. Cook, Gen. Mgr. Rindge Land & Navigation Co., Stockton
Miss Alice M. Brown, Sacramento
Dr. H. H. Guy, Berkeley
James Tyson, San Francisco
George W. Turner, Los Gatos
Alfred C. Elkinton, Berkeley, Pres. Philadelphia Quartz Co. of California
Francis B. Kellogg, Los Angeles
L. M. Landsborough, Florin
A. R. Rideout, Whittier
Mrs. Laurretta Black, Yolo
G. P. Hurst, Woodland
Grosvenor P. Ayres, San Francisco
Mrs. Mary Roberts Coolidge, Professor Mills College, Oakland
Asa V. Mendenhall, Oakland
Rev. Henry Stauffer, Los Angeles
Virginia E. Graeff, Hollywood
W. S. Alexander, San Francisco
Ellen Moore, Pasadena
Philip H. Dodge, Santa Cruz
Mrs. Philip H. Dodge, Santa Cruz
Prof. Raymond L. Buell, Long Beach
Dr. Carl Patton, Minister First Congregational Church, Los Angeles
E. C. Horst, San Francisco
Richard R. Perkins, General Secretary Y. M. C. A., San Francisco
Albert Elliott, San Francisco
Dr. H. B. Johnson, Berkeley
Guy C. Calden, San Francisco
Marion B. Patton, South Pasadena
Clarence M. Smith, Northwestern Mutual Life Ins. Co., San Francisco
Dr. E. A. Sturge, San Francisco
Dr. Alexander Beers, San Francisco, Member Executive Committee, Free
Methodist
Thomas B. Dozier, San Francisco
John P. Irish, Oakland

- Miss Alice Barrett, Greenwood, Cal.
Alexander Fiore, 521 L St., Box 449, Sacramento, Cal.
Miss Margaret B. Curry, 616 Buchanan St., San Francisco, Cal.
Mrs. J. E. Bell, Almond Hill, Saratoga, Cal.
Wilmer Sieg, Box 602, Sacramento, Cal.
C. M. Wooster, 320 Phelan Bldg., San Francisco, Cal.
Frank A. Guernsey, President Farmers and Merchants Bank, Stockton, Cal.
Mrs. Fred Wyman Vaughn, 2211 California St., San Francisco, Cal.
Geo. A. Atherton, Delta Lands, Stockton, Cal.
Fred C. Rindge, Stockton, Cal.
Charles A. Strong, Crocker Bank Bldg., San Francisco, Cal.
A. N. Judd, Watsonville, Cal.
Mrs. S. M. Richardson, Truckee, Cal.
William C. Allen, Hotel Vendome, San Jose, Cal.
Miss Sarah Ellis, 1350 Washington St., San Francisco, Cal.
Mrs. Adelaide Gail Frost, 1710 East 4th St., Long Beach, Cal.
Prof. Ray Malcom, University of So. Cal., Los Angeles, Cal.
Mrs. Louise C. Maud, Monterey, Cal.
Mrs. Margaret C. May, 1285 Oak St., San Francisco, Cal.
Dr. B. B. Juilly, R. F. D. Box 134, Colma, San Mateo Co., Cal.
A. C. Stevens, Lafayette Apartments, Berkeley, Cal.
Mrs. L. M. Eskridge, 1480 Larkin St., San Francisco, Cal.
Mrs. Clara Mahoney, 968 Ellis St., San Francisco, Cal.
Florence L. Stephens, Attorney-at-Law, 629-630 Western Mutual Life Bldg.,
Third and Hill, Los Angeles, Cal.
Chas. E. Virden, Gen. Mgr. Calif. Fruit Distribution, Sacramento, Cal.
Mrs. A. E. Thurber, Napa, Cal.
Geo. S. Nickerson, Civil and Hydraulic Eng., Forum Bldg., Sacramento, Cal.

FOREWORD

DURING the California campaign of 1920, on the anti-Japanese initiative, the opponents of that measure were denied publicity by the press of the State. The initiative was of such a character as required discussion. It deprived Japanese and Chinese of the most important of the primitive rights of humanity, by denying to parents of those races the right to be guardians of their own children, and turning their young over to the guardianship of the Public Administrator.

In a Christian community, such a departure from the law of nature and the principles of the Christian religion should have been freely and widely discussed by the press, but it was not.

The proponents of the initiative, given the free use of the publicity facilities of the press, used it to promote the impression that the measure would effect the exclusion of Oriental immigration. To the end of fostering this false impression, the press bristled with defamation of the Japanese. From every angle they were attacked by the most appalling slanders and falsehoods.

Under these circumstances, the conscience of the State sought expression and found it in the organization of The American Committee of Justice. That Committee stated the case from every angle and viewpoint in advertisements which it published in the papers of every county in the State. These advertisements are the literature of the campaign. The persecutors of the Japanese have not ventured to deny any statement made in them. Their truth stands unchallenged and undisputed as the righteous statement of the case.

To preserve this literature and perpetuate this statement of facts, in order that enlightenment of public opinion may be promoted, these advertisements are published in this booklet. Let the reader remember that they are the cry of the conscience of California, the expression of its sense of justice, and that they were supported by the votes of 222,086 citizens of the State, who smote the infamous initiative with their ballots.

The Committee sends this message of Truth to the people of the United States, for the healing of a public opinion that has been poisoned by falsehood and hate.

The public expressions of independent bodies of citizens are included, as well as a translation from the *New World*, a San Francisco Japanese newspaper.

Fair Play

All far-seeing Californians concur that the influx of Oriental laborers should be prevented. But this can be done only by the Federal Government, not by any State action. We as honest Americans stand for justice in dealing with Japanese who came here at our invitation.

There is an initiative law to be voted on November 2, denying to the Japanese certain human rights involving our honor and our traditions of fair play.

This law proposes not only to drive the Japanese from the agricultural lands of California, but to deny Japanese children born on American soil the right to have their own parents as guardians.

It is a natural right that the parent is the guardian of the child. This bill provides that the child may be removed from the guardianship of the parent to the guardianship of a public administrator. If Japan should propose a law of that kind touching American children within her jurisdiction, our Government would very firmly and properly demand its repeal.

This law, forbidding the Japanese to lease farmlands, sentences them into competition with American labor in the cities.

It prohibits the Japanese from buying even a single share in any American corporation owning real property.

These proposals are a clear violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of our Constitution, which declares that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The people of Arizona adopted by initiative a law discriminatory against various aliens, which the United States Supreme Court voided as unconstitutional, saying in its decision: "Equal protection of the law is applicable to all persons, without regard to any difference of race, color or nationality. Discrimination under the pretense of promoting the health, safety or morals and welfare, denies the very essence of personal freedom and opportunity it was the purpose of the Constitution to secure."

This anti-Japanese initiative discriminates between aliens in the right to lease land, and between minor children of aliens in the ownership of land, and is plainly unconstitutional.

The law will embarrass our Federal Government, in whose hands lies the final solution of the question. The State Department is now endeavoring to revise our agreement with Japan for the purpose of excluding Japanese immigration more effectively.

What California wants is not a policy of legal persecution directed against Japanese who are already here, but a constructive immigration policy calculated to safeguard the State against further influx of Oriental labor. The proposed initiative law offers no such solution. It simply complicates the situation and will make the adjustment of the real issue all the more difficult.

Not only does this law invite us to commit an act of injustice and to violate our Constitution, but it insults an honorable nation—a nation which, when San Francisco was on fire, sent a gift of \$250,000 in gold; a nation which has repeatedly manifested respect and friendship for our country.

Japan was the first to participate in our great international exposition in San Francisco, at a cost of almost a million dollars. During the war the

Japanese in our midst contributed two million dollars to our war funds, and at the instance of our Government, rendered invaluable assistance in the production of food materials needed to feed our armies.

Vote NO on Initiative No. 1 on November 2.

Common Sense

The first of the proposed measures on the November ballot is the "Alien Land Law." Before voting on it November 2, we ask you to consider these facts:

The population of California is 3,426,526, of which only 2 per cent are Japanese. In 1919 more white children were born in the State than the total of Japanese births for the ten years preceding.

California should not be placed in the position of 98 per cent of her population being in fear of 2 per cent.

In the last ten years our population increased 1,058,987. It was a 44.1 per cent increase, while that of the whole United States was only 14 per cent. Does that look like the State is being destroyed by its 2 per cent of Japanese?

Our food supply is not keeping up with the increase of population. The first seven months of this year we did not produce enough to feed our own people; imports of food increased \$1,500,000,000.

Why expel the Japanese farmers who raised \$67,000,000 worth of food last year?

To persecute them off the land will make the shortage of farm labor more acute, put thousands of acres out of cultivation, reduce our food supply and inflict economic injury to the State.

Japanese labor on land is non-competitive. It gets the highest farm wages paid in the world. This initiative will drive it from non-competitive labor on land to competitive labor in the cities, where it consumes but no longer produces food. This change is equally injurious to city labor and to the consumers of food. This view was taken by the Labor Councils of Stockton and Sacramento in resolutions opposing "the removal of the Oriental from land to the industries."

Japan permits a corporation, though composed entirely of non-Japanese, to own in fee simple all the land it can buy. It also allows alien individuals to lease land of any kind for fifty years, and to acquire superficies for unlimited period. Yet Initiative No. 1 denies this reciprocal right to a handful of Japanese in California.

Foreigners in Japan, by concessions in perpetuity, own, with improvements, land worth many millions on which they do not even pay taxes. Yet Initiative No. 1 seeks to deny the industrious Japanese in California the human right of even leasing land for productive purposes.

Much has been said of the Japanese law which claims the allegiance of Japanese born in America. French law claims a child born abroad of French parents as a French citizen, subject, if a male, to military service the moment he enters French jurisdiction. Switzerland, Italy, Greece and Germany have similar laws.

Japan is more liberal than these countries, for she allows a child born abroad of Japanese parents to relinquish allegiance to Japan at any time before the age of 17.

Our National Government alone has power to settle all international

questions. We look to Eastern Asia for expansion of our trade. These anti-Japanese movements, and the vituperation and abuse by agitators, and this initiative, do not represent Americanism. They disgrace and embarrass our National Government. Why do it, and injure ourselves at the same time?

Our Secretary of Commerce reports that in the eight months ending August 31, this year, we sold our goods to Asia and Oceania as follows:

To Dutch East Indies	\$34,995,550	}	\$331,195,036
To China	96,311,017		
To Australia	73,054,230		
To British India	65,744,078		
To The Philippines	61,090,161		
To Japan			\$328,663,681

Japan bought of us within \$2,531,355 as much as all Asia and Oceania combined. Is it wise to alienate that commerce by mistreating the Japanese in California?

Vote NO on Initiative No. 1 on November 2.

Defeat It

Between the National question of Oriental immigration and the State question of how to treat the Japanese now in California there should be a clear line of distinction.

The question of Oriental immigration can be solved only by the Federal Administration and Congress. No individual State has power to regulate immigration. And it is precisely the restriction of Oriental immigration in which California is most vitally interested.

Initiative No. 1 on the ballot to be voted on next Tuesday, November 2, is totally ineffective in attaining this end. It will not, and cannot, restrict Oriental immigration, and therefore will not serve the purpose which all far-sighted Californians are anxious to attain.

Not only is this Initiative utterly useless as a means of restricting Oriental immigration, but it is calculated to impede the Federal Government in its endeavor to devise methods to bar out Orientals more effectively.

The State Department is now negotiating a new treaty with Japan for the exclusion of Japanese immigration. Congress, as the result of a recent investigation on the Coast, will also take action for the same purpose. If California ignores this move at Washington and enacts an arbitrary law designed to persecute Orientals already here, it will simply irritate the Federal Government and alienate its sympathy from us.

Initiative No. 1 aims to dispossess a helpless minority of aliens who have come here at our invitation and who are tilling California's soil in compliance with our laws. This Initiative, totally ineffective in restricting future Oriental immigration, merely persecutes the aliens against whom it is directed, and sows the seed of distrust in their minds. No fair-minded, far-seeing Californian could endorse such a proposition.

Only 2 per cent of California's total population is Japanese. In 1919 more white children were born in California than all the Japanese children born here in the ten years preceding. We should not be placed in the ridiculous position of 98 per cent of our population being in fear of 2 per

cent. We would be confessing ourselves weaklings and fools if we were to think that our institutions and civilization are being endangered by the presence of such a small number of Japanese, unobtrusive, law-abiding, minding their own business, and bothering nobody.

The area of land cultivated by Japanese in California amounts to only 1.6 per cent of our farm land. Even of this 1.6 per cent only a very small portion is actually owned or controlled by them. No man with a healthy mind can believe that this is a grave menace to the State.

Neither organized commerce nor organized labor is in sympathy with this Initiative. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has taken a definite stand against it. The labor councils of Sacramento and Stockton oppose it. Why? Because they know that this Initiative is based not upon the real need of the State, but upon the unreal fear conjured up by designing persons.

Japan permits a corporation, though composed entirely of non-Japanese, to own land. It also allows alien individuals to lease land for fifty years, and to acquire superficies for unlimited period. Yet this Initiative denies this reciprocal privilege to a handful of Japanese in California.

This Initiative is an affront to the American tradition of honor and fair play. Our innate sense of justice revolts against it. It should be defeated because it insults the American people, rather than because it works hardship for the Japanese.

Defeat this Initiative, and we shall be in a stronger position in urging the Federal Government to protect California against further influx of Oriental immigration. Adopt it, and we shall merely embarrass our Government and make the solution of the real trouble all the more difficult.

Vote NO on Initiative No. 1 on November 2.

Think Twice

On your November ballot is an unjust law. It is Initiative No. 1, known as the Alien Land Law.

It aims to dispossess a helpless minority of aliens industriously tilling California's soil.

The State Board of Control reports that Japanese cultivated 458,056 acres last year. California has an area of 99,617,280 acres, of which about 28,000,000 is farm land.

Of this vast farm land, only 1.6 per cent is cultivated by Japanese. Upon this 1.6 per cent they produce 13 per cent of California's total food output.

Their produce is valued at \$67,000,000, of which 35 per cent is paid land owners as rentals and 45 per cent to labor as wages. The balance of 20 per cent is the reward for Japanese tenants and contractors.

The Japanese have taken up much of the worst land and made it fertile, thus helping to reduce the cost of food for the city worker.

With effective restriction of Japanese immigration now being considered at Washington, there need be no fear that the small Japanese population now here will ever become a dominating element.

The present Japanese population is only 2 per cent of the total. The highest Japanese birth rate is only 7.4 per cent of the whole as against 90.8 per cent of American births.

Within a few years Japanese births will become even less, because [1] immigrants, irrespective of race, have fewer children after the first genera-

tion; [2] the average age of Japanese male adults now here is about 40; [3] the abolition of "picture marriages" will make it more difficult for Japanese to marry; [4] the arrivals of Japanese will decrease as the result of present diplomatic negotiations.

The Japanese have long since ceased to compete with American labor, but this initiative, if passed, will drive them from the land and compel them to compete with American labor in the cities, seriously cutting food production.

Labor's interest in this question is defined in the following recommendations by the Stockton Labor Council and Building Trades Council, and the Sacramento Federated Trades Council: "[1] absolute restriction of all alien immigration; [2] no fight to be made upon any person or persons who are legal residents of the United States; [3] organize all workers who are capable of taking a union man's job; [4] we do not favor the removal of the Oriental from land to the industries."

According to the 1920 census, population of our cities in the last decade increased 25.2 per cent, while the population of farm territories increased only 3.2 per cent.

Yet this Alien Land Law seeks to drive the natural farmers from the soil, condemn into idleness 400,000 acres of land now highly productive, and decrease California's annual food production by \$67,000,000.

The Japanese is not the kind of an immigrant who comes here intending to "make a stake" and return to his own country. He is here to take his part in the economic life of the State, honorably and industriously, paying taxes, and helping to support our social institutions, our roads, our schools and local governments.

Our sense of decency and fairness enjoins us to deal justly with these Japanese, insisting, at the same time, through the Federal Government, upon the prevention of further influx of Oriental immigration.

Vote NO on Initiative No. 1 on November 2.

An Argument Against the Alien Land Initiative Law

By JOHN P. IRISH

(The following argument was prepared at the request of the Lieutenant Governor of California and was printed in the official pamphlet of instruction to voters. The Argument for the same law was prepared by Mr. V. S. McClatchy, also at the Lieutenant Governor's request.)

This initiative raises questions of cold law, to which I invite the very thoughtful attention of the voters.

Our treaty with Japan provides that the Japanese here "may own or hire and occupy houses, manufactories, warehouses, shops and premises, and lease land for residential and commercial purposes." In its economic definition commerce consists of Production, Transmutation and Exchange. Production is the ranking element, because without it there can be no commerce. The treaty protects the right of Japanese to hire or own manufactories, for transmutation, warehouses, necessary to exchange, and to lease land for commercial purposes. Land employed in agricultural production is employed in a commercial purpose. The treaty is intended, then, to give the Japanese privilege to enter upon complete commerce, and therefore protects their right to lease land for production. Any other interpretation twists the plain language of the treaty into vain repetition. Considered in the light of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which says: "No State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law," we find the initiative in conflict with our own Constitution, since it proposes a discriminatory classification of aliens, conferring upon one class the protection of the law which it denies to another class.

This discrimination applies also to the leasing of land denied to Japanese and permitted to other aliens. It also applies to the feature of the initiative which subjects Japanese minors who own land to the guardianship of the Public Administrator, but exempts other alien minors who own land from such guardianship.

These proposed discriminations against classes of aliens were adopted by the people of another State by the initiative and were voided by the U. S. Supreme Court as unconstitutional. That court held that "equal protection of the laws is applicable to all persons, without regard to any differences of race, color, or nationality," and that discrimination under the pretense of "promoting the health, safety, morals and welfare" is unconstitutional, and denies "the very essence of personal freedom and opportunity it was the purpose of the amendment to secure." And "if such freedom could be refused upon the ground of race or nationality, the prohibition of the denial to any person of the equal protection of the laws would be a barren form of words."

In the foregoing I have stripped the initiative of its cryptic and involved language and technicalities, so that it is naked in its two purposes: first, to forbid the leasing of land to Japanese and Chinese; and second, to take land-owning minors of those races from the natural guardianship of the parents and commit them to the control of the Public Administrator. All the other confusing propositions of the initiative respecting holdings in corporations, etc., are subordinate to these two. Landowners are warned that if the State can forbid them to lease to a certain class, it can also compel them to lease to a certain other class. They must resist this invasion of liberty.

Memorial to Congress

By American Committee of Justice

DECEMBER 10, 1920.

*To the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States, in Congress assembled:*

The undersigned citizens of California, the members of The American Committee of Justice, beg respectfully to present the following facts regarding the Japanese and their persecution in California.

The Federal census of 1920 shows 70,000 Japanese in California, being 2 per cent of the total population of the State.

The report of the California State Board of Control shows the Japanese farmers, by ownership and lease, cultivate one and six-tenths per cent of the farm land of the State. On this they produce 13 per cent of the field crops of the State, of a value in 1919 of \$67,000,000. The vital statistics of the State Board of Health show that in 1919 more white children were born in California than Japanese children for the entire ten years preceding.

The penological statistics of the State show so small a percentage of crime amongst the Japanese as to be a negligible feature.

The eleemosynary records show no Japanese in the almshouses.

The facts of daily observation by those in nearest contact with the Japanese disclose their extreme personal cleanliness, good standard of living in diet and dress, high sexual morality, personal honesty, fidelity to contracts, and high percentage of education, and intelligence.

The record shows them greatly patriotic during the world war, the buyers of millions of our war bonds and contributors of tens of thousands to the Red Cross. Their contributions per capita to these patriotic war purposes were far in excess of those made by any other class of aliens.

The prejudice against them exists amongst people who have had no experience with them, and are readily deceived by the rampant slanders of agitators. In our population of 3,426,861, you will readily understand that all cannot have had contact and experience with our 2 per cent of Japanese. The 222,086 Californians who voted against the anti-Japanese initiative were citizens who knew the Japanese. Those who supported and carried that measure were mostly citizens who knew the Japanese only by hearsay, and that mostly slander and falsehood.

Since the election the truth is getting a better chance. During the campaign the San Francisco *Chronicle* reeked with slander of the Japanese and shared this course with the press of the State. But now that votes are no longer needed, the *Chronicle*, in its issue of November 17th, in an editorial under the caption "Our Immigration Problem," said:

"The East concerns itself very little about Oriental immigration, because it does not see it and because the number of such immigrants is absolutely negligible as compared with those who are seeking to crowd in from Southern Europe and Western Asia and perhaps Northern Africa.

"And there could be a good argument made to the effect that the Japanese, for example, with all their unassimilability, are far less dangerous immigrants than those of the mongrel races who inhabit the Mediterranean littoral. The Japanese among us are law abiding, industrious—too industrious some think—do not intrude them-

selves into our affairs but adapt themselves to our conditions. The mongrels of the Near East have been revolutionists from the dawn of history, have always been fighting each other, and make trouble wherever they go, and yet they are eligible to citizenship."

This is in itself an admission of the falsity of the campaign issue made against the Japanese.

As citizens of California, we protest against any unfriendly legislation against Japan or the Japanese who are domiciled here. The pretense that 98 per cent of the population of this State is in imminent danger from our 2 per cent of Japanese is disgraceful to the manhood of our people. If it were true, then it certifies such decay of the white race as foreshadows its speedy extinction, regardless of the presence of, or contact with, any other race. Of course, such pretense is fantastic, and when it threatens the peace of nations it is criminal.

Representing the 222,086 voters of California who cast their ballots against the anti-Japanese initiative, we have the honor to suggest to the Congress that the power and peace, the dignity and honor of this Republic require that we no longer violate treaties with nations that are too weak to resist, and that in our legislation we treat all nations and people alike, afraid of none, but just to all.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF JUSTICE.

(Signed by all members.)

APPENDIX I

Amendment No. 1

(A statement published in Palo Alto newspapers by President Wilbur and a number of professors of Leland Stanford University.)

The undersigned, members of the faculty of Stanford University, earnestly request their fellow citizens of the Palo Alto and Stanford communities to vote against Initiative Act No. 1 (Alien Land Law) at the election on Tuesday.

This measure is designed to prohibit the leasing of land by aliens ineligible to citizenship, to prevent such aliens from holding shares in any corporation owning agricultural land, and to prevent the native-born children of such aliens from having land held for them by their parents.

The reason most commonly advanced for such a law is to "keep California white." As a matter of fact, it will not have the slightest effect upon such a desirable end. The control of immigration is vested in the United States Government. The States have no voice in the matter. The proposed law, instead of furthering the execution of our national policy, which is opposed to the unrestricted immigration of people from Asia, will only weaken the efforts of our National Government to bring it about. For when Washington tries, by treaty, to secure restrictions, the Asiatic states will, very properly, insist that first of all the discriminations which have been raised against their lawful residents in this country be removed.

The proposed measure also is contrary to the whole spirit of our institutions. Everyone must recognize that the Nation has the right to scrutinize carefully every alien whom it admits to its shores. But once admitted, the Nation must see to it that all aliens are treated with absolute fairness and impartiality. We must not raise up racial discriminations among the people who are lawfully resident among us. For this reason, the proposed measure is objectionable in principle. And because it needlessly complicates the relations between our National Government and the great states across the Pacific, the people of California owe it to the people of our Nation as a whole to do nothing which will hamper the Federal Government in carrying out the national policy, which is one of strict regulation of immigration from the Orient.

Ray Lyman Wilbur
E. D. Adams
W. H. Carruth
M. S. Wildman
C. A. Huston
M. R. Kirkwood
Raymond M. Alden
Payson J. Treat
Everett W. Smith

John S. P. Tatlock
John M. Stillman
Edwin A. Cottrell
F. M. Russell
H. D. Gray
P. A. Martin
O. L. Elliott
Douglas H. Campbell
David Starr Jordan

APPENDIX II

Our Position

(The following statement was advertised in the leading newspapers in California on October 28 and 30.)

In view of the fact that the presence of large numbers of Orientals in certain parts of our country has given rise to serious problems, we believe that further immigration from that source would surely endanger the good relations existing between the United States and our Oriental neighbors. It is evident to all that the time has come when a satisfactory control of immigration must be sought.

The governments of the United States and Japan are now seriously seeking a final settlement of all problems arising out of the immigration situation. This fact is exceedingly encouraging and gives promise of bringing to a peaceful end a vexatious and delicate international matter. If it is left in the hands of diplomacy there is every reason to believe that all dangers of misunderstanding will be avoided and a mutually agreeable settlement reached speedily.

The so-called Japanese problem can not be settled by the action of one or several States, as it is essentially a matter of immigration. The experience of the last few years fully bears this out. Therefore, any such action by California at the present time will surely result only in further complicating the situation, confusing the issue, and making Federal action more difficult.

We, therefore, strongly advise voters to leave the question wholly in the hands of the Federal Government, at least until every opportunity has been given to reach a conclusion.

Vote NO on Initiative Measure No. 1.

Wallace M. Alexander, Alexander & Baldwin, Ltd., San Francisco

Rolla V. Watt, Royal Insurance Co., San Francisco

Geo. I. Cochran, President Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles

Lee A. Phillips, V. P. Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles

Frank Miller, Mission Inn, Riverside

Rev. H. B. Johnson, D. D., Berkeley

Dr. Arthur H. Briggs, San Francisco

Rev. J. L. Gordon, D. D., First Congregational Church, San Francisco

Rev. Elbert R. Dille, D. D., Oakland

J. A. McGregor, Formerly with U. S. Shipping Board

Milton H. Esberg, M. A. Gunst Co., San Francisco

Dr. Benjamin Ide Wheeler, President Emeritus University of California

Dr. Harvey H. Guy, Berkeley

Fred D. Parr, Parr Terminal Co., Oakland

Capt. Robert Dollar, Robert Dollar S. S. Co., San Francisco

APPENDIX III

Fair Treatment

(An advertisement published in Stockton newspapers shortly before the election.)

We, the undersigned Stocktonians, are NOT in favor of the Initiative Measure No. 1, on the following grounds:

1. BECAUSE, it will serve no purpose except inflame public sentiment in Japan against the United States and make it harder for the State Department to make an amicable adjustment of the present difficulties.
2. BECAUSE, it denies to the Japanese certain human rights involving our honor and our traditions of fair play. This proposed law denies to Japanese children born on American soil the right to have their own parents as guardians, and provides that the child may be removed from the guardianship of the parent to the guardianship of the Public Administrator.
3. BECAUSE, it is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States. What California wants is not a policy of legal persecution directed against Japanese who are already here, but a constructive immigration policy calculated to safeguard the State against further influx of Oriental labor. The proposed Initiative Law offers no such solution.

W. J. Armanino, Real Estate, Triolo, Caletini & Co.

J. A. Baumel, Bookkeeper, Commission Merchant

D. W. Braddock, Real Estate

California Delta Farms Company, by George Burton

Henry Colberg

Wm. Colberg, President Colberg Motor Boats

T. E. Connolly, Banker

Carson C. Cook, Rindge Land & Navigation Co.

Francis Cutting

Lewis H. Delpy

E. C. Dickinson, Dickinson-Nelson Company

R. M. Dixon, Commission Merchant

Rev. F. L. Donohoo

J. T. Fletcher, Empire Barge Company

John W. Galway, Grain Company

Frank A. Guernsey, Banker

Rev. Harley H. Gill

Rev. R. W. Harlow

Edward Harris, Banker

Jas. Higgins, Commission Merchant

L. L. Higgins, Commission Merchant

Frank W. Hill

Sol D. Klein, Commission Merchant

George W. Leistner

E. Lewis, Commission Merchant

Rev. Angus Matheson

Laurence E. Moore, Manager Colberg Motor Boats

John Nichols, President Nichols Transportation Company

H. F. W. Puchmuller

John Raggio, Banker

W. C. Ramsey, Real Estate

J. W. Schuler, Guernsey Grain Company
F. C. Sloan, Seed Grower
Lafayette Smallpage, Attorney
T. R. Stribley, Blacksmith
R. B. Teefy, Banker
B. Walters, Manager Island Transportation Co.
A. J. Wheeler, Wheeler Transportation Company
E. L. Wilhoit, Banker
Dr. I. S. Zeimer
Dr. Robert R. Hammond
Dr. R. T. McGurk
Dr. B. F. Walker
Dr. Hudson Smythe
Dr. E. L. Blackmun
J. E. Funk
D. C. Stowe

APPENDIX IV

How We Faced the Crisis

*(From the "New World," San Francisco, a Japanese daily,
for November 10.)*

As we ponder over returns on the vote on the Alien Land Initiative Measure, we are overwhelmed with a sense of gratitude for the friendly and sympathetic efforts which have been made for the cause of justice by many influential Americans.

These Americans, with no solicitation from any Japanese, have exercised their influence against the adoption of the proposed measure. It is indeed a remarkable thing that so many Americans should, unsolicited and unrequested, come to the assistance of the Japanese. Undoubtedly they did this not so much for us as for the cause which they had sincerely at heart. Without doubt they saw in the proposed measure grave injustice and inequity which would stain the honor and dignity of the American Nation.

Nevertheless, we have every reason to be thankful for their friendly efforts. These broad-minded, sympathetic, honorable Americans are legion, and it is impossible to mention their names here.

It is very significant that the votes cast against the Alien Land Measure were more than one-third of the total ballots cast on the election day. Although election returns are not yet complete, we see that 230,000 voters voted against the proposition and in favor of the Japanese. Those who voted for the measure number 608,000.

When California submitted the Chinese question to the vote of the people in 1880, only 880 ballots were cast in favor of the Chinese. The ballots cast against them were 161,400. When we compare these figures with the figures for the Alien Land Initiative Measure that was voted on last Tuesday, we have every reason to be thankful to the fairness of the voters of California.

This is all the more remarkable when we consider that, during the past two years, a formidable organized campaign has been carried on by the forces opposing the Japanese, as well as by practically all the newspapers in the

State. The Japanese were not given hearing at all in the columns of any newspaper. Publicity was completely denied them. Meanwhile meetings and conferences have been held in different parts of the State for the purposes of advancing the anti-Japanese movement.

Against this formidable campaign we made no attempt to counteract its effects. We were powerless in the face of that campaign. We had no organization to assist us. It was only during the few weeks before the election that the Japanese Association sent out a few documents, presenting authentic facts on the question, and that a number of sympathetic Americans began to realize the seriousness of the situation, and, with no solicitation from us, came to our rescue. When we consider that in the past two years the other side entirely monopolized the public ear, we have every reason to be thankful that the result of the vote proved conclusively that the sentiment in California on this question is far from entirely against the Japanese. We are convinced that the people of California are fair-minded and mean to be just.

During the week preceding the election, it was an agreeable surprise to us to see in the newspapers advertisements signed by many prominent Americans, presenting strong arguments against the Alien Land Initiative Measure. To these Americans, who had not only the courage of their convictions, but also the kindness to make considerable sacrifice in order to place those arguments in the newspapers, we owe a great debt of gratitude. In one of these advertisements we notice the following expression:

"This Initiative is an affront to the American tradition of honor and fair play. Our innate sense of justice revolts against it. It should be defeated because it insults the American people, rather than because it works hardship for the Japanese."

It is also pleasant to recall that the President and a number of professors of Stanford University published a statement against the measure. In that statement we see the following utterance:

"The proposed measure is contrary to the whole spirit of our institutions. Everyone must recognize that the Nation has the right to scrutinize carefully every alien whom it admits to its shores. But once admitted, the Nation should see to it that all aliens are treated with absolute fairness and impartiality."

When we read such dignified statements as these, we are convinced that the American tradition of fair play and justice is still a vital force in American life. Our respect and love of Americanism and American institutions have been greatly deepened and strengthened by the experiences we have passed through in the strenuous weeks preceding the election. For this we have every reason to be thankful to the American people.

At the same time, we feel justified in saying that the Japanese Association and individual Japanese have all along maintained a dignified attitude towards Senator Phelan and other gentlemen who have been advancing the anti-Japanese movement. We have examined every document that has been sent out by the Japanese Association, and we have never come across any remark or criticism about the gentlemen who have been attacking us. We are proud that we have passed through the strenuous weeks with remarkable self-restraint and dignity, and we hope and trust that the Japanese in California, whatever the other side may do, will not lose their mental poise and their dignity of attitude. We have no malice towards anybody, and we face the future with the spirit of tolerance and gratefulness with which we have maintained our position in the past.

